

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **November 14, 2006** and to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated **March 8, 2007**. In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a); claims 1-9 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Keith et al (5,702,439); and claims 10-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the amendment document filed on February 21, 2007 was determined to be non-compliant because a new paragraph was underlined.

Applicant has deleted the underlining of the new paragraph in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment of March 8, 2007.

The following comments are presented in the same order, with section headings, as the Office Action of November 14, 2006.

37 CFR 1.83(a)

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant has submitted herewith replacement sheet for Fig. 2 and new drawings Figs. 5 and 6. These replacement and new figures show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection.

35 USC 102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Keith et al (5,702,439). To further prosecution, Applicant has amended instant independent claim 1. Applicant asserts that Keith does not teach “a first portion of the inner tubular member engaged to the coating on a second portion of the end region of the proximal tubular member to define a second engagement region,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection and asserts that independent claim 1 and claims 2-9 and 12-15 dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Allowed Claims

In the Office Action, claims 10-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim Applicants acknowledge the finding of allowable subject matter in the instant claims, however, as discussed above, Keith et al does not teach all the elements recited in independent claim 1 upon which claims 10-11 depend. Therefore Applicants assert that claims 10-11 are patentable in their current form.

Conclusion

Based on at least the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 is requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: April 6, 2007

By: / Jennifer L. Buss /
Jennifer L. Buss
Registration No.: 57321

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\jlb\10990us01_amd_20070314.doc